

## Durham Research Online

---

### Deposited in DRO:

26 July 2019

### Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

### Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

### Citation for published item:

Crossley, S. (2016) 'The 'troubled families' numbers game.', Environment and planning A., 48 (1). pp. 4-6.

### Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X15614709>

### Publisher's copyright statement:

Crossley, S. (2016). The 'troubled families' numbers game. Environment and Planning A 48(1): 4-6. © The Author(s) 2015. DOI: 10.1177/0308518X15614709

### Additional information:

---

### Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

# Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Crossley, Stephen (2016) The 'troubled families' numbers game. Environment and Planning A, 48 (1). pp. 4-6. ISSN 0308-518X

Published by: Pion

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0308518X15614709>  
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0308518X15614709>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:  
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/27986/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

[www.northumbria.ac.uk/nrl](http://www.northumbria.ac.uk/nrl)



### **The 'troubled families' numbers game**

In December 2011, the UK Coalition Government launched the Troubled Families Programme, aimed at turning round the lives of the 120,000 most 'troubled families' in England. At the launch of the programme, the Prime Minister David Cameron stated:

I want to talk about troubled families. Let me be clear what I mean by this phrase. Officialdom might call them 'families with multiple disadvantages'. Some in the press might call them 'neighbours from hell'. Whatever you call them, we've known for years that a relatively small number of families are the source of a large proportion of the problems in society (Cameron, 2011).

The figure of 120,000 was derived from research published by the previous government in 2007 on 'families with multiple disadvantages', using data collected in 2004. These disadvantages included housing conditions, material deprivation and health problems but the three national criteria for 'troubled families' included the behavioural characteristics of crime/anti-social behaviour, educational exclusion and worklessness. It was claimed that these families cost the government £9 billion per year. Indicative numbers of 'troubled families' in each local authority area were identified using government deprivation data from 2007 and 'child well-being' data from 2009.

The TFP has been subject to a number of criticisms about the (mis)uses of data with Ruth Levitas arguing that 'anyone with any statistical sophistication will recognise it (the figure of 120,000 'troubled families') as spuriously accurate' (Levitas, 2012: 5). Local authority progress reports on the number of families 'turned around' by the programme are not official statistics and are therefore outside the remit and scrutiny of the UK Statistics Authority. Some local authorities have struggled to identify the number of 'troubled families' they have been allocated (Wiggins, 2012). These concerns and the relative infancy of the programme have not prevented the government from announcing the 'massive expansion' of the programme before any evaluation had reported any findings.

In August 2014, (following an initial announcement in June 2013) the government published six criteria that were used to identify 400,000 more 'troubled families' in England for 'Phase 2' of the programme. They also informed local authorities of the five different data sources from three different years that had been used to identify the families, but didn't disclose the methodology used.

The diagram illustrates the development of the Troubled Families Programme since its launch, with a specific focus on the numbers involved in the programme and the sources of evidence used.

### **References**

- Cameron, D, 2011, *Troubled families speech*, 15 December 2011, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/troubled-families-speech> [Accessed 8 December 2014]
- Levitas, R, 2012, There may be 'trouble' ahead: what we know about those 120,000 'troubled' families, *Policy Response Series No.3*, PSE
- Wiggins, K, 2012, Councils question troubled families numbers, 13 August 2012, <http://www.lgcplus.com/briefings/services/childrens-services/councils-question-troubled-families-numbers/5048165.article> [Accessed 8 December 2014]

**June 2007: Families at risk report identifies 120,000 families offering from 5 out of 7 disadvantages:**

- No parent in the family is in work;
- Family lives in overcrowded housing;
- No parent has any qualifications;
- Mother has mental health problems;
- At least one parent has a long-standing limiting illness, disability or infirmity;
- Family has low income (below 60% of median income);
- Family cannot afford a number of food and clothing items.



**December 2011: Troubled Families Programme launched, with 120,000 'troubled families identified as those who:**

- Are involved in crime and anti-social behaviour;
- Have children not in school;
- Have an adult on out of work benefits;
- Cause high costs to the public purse.

Cost of 'troubled families' is estimated at £9 billion pa, an average of £75,000 per family. Numbers of 'troubled families' in each local authority identified using **Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)** data from 2007 and 'child well-being' data from 2009



**June 2012: The 'massive expansion' of the TFP announced, to include 400,000 'high-risk' families.** No criteria or methodology published in support of this figure



**July 2014: Local authorities informed of data sources for identifying 400,000 more 'troubled families':**

- Families and Children Survey (2008)
- Ministry of Justice survey of adult prisoners (2010)
- Department for Education Children in Need census (as at 31 March 2012)
- Department for Education National Pupil database (as at 31 March 2012)
- Millennium Cohort Study (2012)



**August 2014: Government publishes criteria for 400,000 families':**

- parents and children involved in crime or anti-social behaviour;
- children who have not been attending school regularly;
- children who need help;
- adults out of work or at risk of financial exclusion and young people at risk of worklessness;
- families affected by domestic violence and abuse;
- parents and children with a range of health problems.



**October 2014: Progress information published suggests that 69,508 families had been 'turned around' by August 2014.** Only 5893 of these families had gained continuous employment